

TIBETAN LEXICOGRAPHY AND ETYMOLOGICAL RESEARCH

By W. SIMON

I. Western Lexicography

WHEN dealing with Western Lexicography, the first name to occur readily to one's mind is that of the famous Hungarian traveller, Alexander Csoma de Kőrös (Kőrösi Csoma Sándor) who, misled by the fortuitous likeness in sound of the Ugurs and the German form of the name of Hungary 'Ungarn', set out to find the country of the Ugurs, whom he believed to be the ancestors of his country.

1. THE ITALIAN MISSIONARIES

However, before Csoma's dictionary of 1834, two other Dictionaries must be mentioned, the first of which preceded Csoma by more than one hundred years. Their authors are in either case Italian missionaries, on whose activities we are now very well informed through the monumental work by Luciano Petech: *Missionari Italiani nel Tibet e nel Nepal* (7 vols., Rome, 1952-56). Professor Petech's richly annotated introduction of over 100 pages allows of an easy bird's eye view of their work.

The Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris has preserved in manuscript¹ the extract of a Latin-Tibetan Dictionary which was commenced in 1708 by the Capuchin Friars Giuseppe da Ascoli and Francesco Maria da Tours and completed by F. Domenico da Fano (1674-1728), who took it to Rome in 1713 and made this extract thereof for two French scholars. The manuscript contains about 2,500 words in Tibetan script and an indication of the pronunciation, which is of some interest, as is the remark in the Preface that, owing to their extreme poverty, which forced them to rely on stinging nettles and other weeds for their food, the compilers could not afford to engage Tibetan teachers. One cannot help regretting that Csoma de Kőrös had no access to this first lexicographic effort

¹ Fonds Tibétain No. 542.

which, though not free from errors, might have saved him from starting from scratch about one hundred years later.

Nor had Csoma access to the second Tibetan Dictionary, the first to be printed, though without the name of its author and in an English translation. This is the Dictionary generally known as Schröter's Dictionary, published at the expense of the East India Company in Serampore in 1826. Owing to the investigations of F. Felice d'Anversar in 1912,¹ followed in 1931 and 1934 by those of F. Giovanni (Lenhart) da Reifenberg,² we know now that the author of that Dictionary was a disciple of F. da Fano, the F. Francesco Orazio della Penna (1680-1745). As was explained by Jäschke in the Preface (p. v) to his Dictionary, he was unable to benefit much from the study of Schröter's Dictionary as it must have suffered a great deal in the process of translation without previous revision by a person conversant with Tibetan, and by eventually being seen through the press by persons who were likewise unacquainted with Tibetan. Refuting the 'reckless and absolute condemnation' by Isaak Jacob Schmidt in the Preface to his Tibetan Dictionary, Jäschke writes as follows: 'The papers which he [i.e. Francisco Orazio della Penna] left behind him, unsorted and unsifted, came into the hands of Major Latter, an English officer, and were passed on by him to Mr. Schröter, a missionary in Bengal. English was substituted for the Italian of the manuscript, and the East India Company made a grant which defrayed the cost of the Tibetan types and the further expenses of printing. But there was no Tibetan scholar to correct the proofs. The author would doubtless, on reconsideration, have detected and dismissed much erroneous or unnecessary matter. As it was, many additional mistakes crept in during the passage through the press. Thus the work, though it has a richer

¹ 'Remarks on Tibetan Manuscript vocabularies in Bishop's College,' Calcutta, *JASB* 1912, p. 382.

² 'De vocabulario Thibetano a P. Francisco Horatio de Pennabilli compilato' in *A(nalecta) O(rdinis) M(inorum) C(apuccinorum)*, 47, pp. 303-312, and 'De studiis linguae tibetanæ a Fratribus Minoribus Capuccinis peractis (1707-1773)', *ibid.*, 50, pp. 15-23 and 43-49.

vocabulary than can be found in later dictionaries, cannot on any questionable point be accepted as an authority, and has only value for those who are already competent for themselves to weigh and decide upon the statements and interpretations it advances.'

2. KÖRÖSI CSOMA SÁNDOR (1784–1842)

Coming now to Csoma's Dictionary¹ of 1834 we meet with a pioneer work whose importance cannot be overestimated. As Jäschke put it, 'The work of Csoma de Kőrös is that of an original investigator and the fruit of almost unparalleled determination and patience. The compiler, in order to dedicate himself to the study of Tibetan literature, lived like a monk for years among the inmates of a Tibetan monastery.' I limit myself here to refer to the biographies by Th. Duka (London, 1885) and the recent study by the late Dr. E. Baktay (Budapest, 1962), as far as biographical details are concerned.²

But it is important to realize that we witness here a very reliable dictionary of the earlier literary language. Definitions of single words are regularly accompanied by lists of compounds, but there are no examples to illustrate the meanings of either single words or compounds.

3. ISAAK JACOB SCHMIDT (1779–1847)

In 1841 IsaaK Jacob Schmidt's *Tibetan–German Dictionary* (with a German–Tibetan Index) was published, followed two

¹ Modestly entitled *Essay towards a dictionary, Tibetan and English*.

² Dr. A. Róna Tas kindly refers me to several papers written on Csoma by Professor L. Ligeti. They are the following:—

'A jugarok földje' (The land of the Yugars) in *Magyar Nyelv* xxvii (1931), 300–314.

'Ouvrages tibétains rédigés à l'usage de Csoma' in *T'oung Pao* xxx (1933), 26–36.

'Les pérégrinations de Csoma de Kőrös et le pays des Yugar' in *Revue des Études Hongroises* xii (Paris 1934), 233–253.

'Alexandre Csoma de Kőrös' in *Nouvelle Revue de Hongrie* 1935, 495–501.

'Az ismeretlen Belső-Ázsia' (Unknown Central Asia), Budapest 1940 (on Csoma, pp. 175–181).

'Alexander Kőrösi Csoma' in *Ungarn* 1942, 535–543.

'Kőrösi Csoma Sándor emlékezete' (In memoriam K.Cs.S.) in *Kőrösi Csoma Archivum* iii (1942), 111–118.

years later by a Tibetan-Russian version. This was preponderantly a translation into German (with a rearrangement of entries according to Tibetan practice) of Csoma's dictionary. Though, to quote Jäschke (Preface, p. v), 'the relation of that work to its predecessors has been left by its author in some obscurity', even a cursory comparison of entries in Csoma's and Schmidt's dictionaries cannot fail to reveal the dependence of the latter on the former. The layout of the entries is identical even in the sequence of the compounds, though an alphabetical arrangement, as introduced by Jäschke (who therein was followed by Sarat Chandra Das) would have imposed itself to a second independent compiler as an indispensable prerequisite. There are, however, additions of words and compounds. These have been taken from two Tibetan-Mongolian dictionaries, viz. the *Nyi-hod* and the *Bod-kyi brda-yig rtogs-par sla-ba*, the Manchu-Mongolian-Chinese-Tibetan 'Four language Mirror' (*Syhtii chingwen-jiann*), constituting his third source. According to Schmidt those additions amount to over 5,000 words and compounds. Jäschke has carefully indicated words he had only found in Schmidt's Dictionary and from the point of view of etymological research, they have to be treated with particular care since they may have been misread or mistranslated in the process of transference from the above-mentioned three dictionaries. It is therefore to be regretted that Das' Dictionary often leaves out the mark of provenance *Sch*.

4. HERMANN AUGUST JÄSCHKE (1817-1883)

Thirty-seven years after the publication of Csoma's Dictionary we meet with another great lexicographic achievement. Preceded by his small lithographed *Romanized Tibetan and English Dictionary* of 1866, we witness H. A. Jäschke's (likewise lithographed) *Tibetisch-deutsches Wörterbuch* (Gnadau, 1871).¹ This but for minor emendations and a much improved

¹ 1871-75, according to W. Zaunmüller, *Bibliographisches Handbuch der Sprachwörterbücher*, Stuttgart, 1958.

layout, hardly differs ¹ from its English printed version of 1881 which (in slightly reduced size) has been reprinted three times (in 1934, 1949 and 1958).

In paying tribute to Jäschke's dictionary it may suffice to refer to the passage in his preface where he speaks about his aims (pp. iii-iv): 'A consistent attempt is here made for the first time, 1. to give a rational account of the development of the values and meanings of words in this language; 2. to distinguish precisely the various transitions in periods of literature and varieties of dialect; 3. to make sure of each step by the help of accurate and copious illustrations and examples. I have done my utmost to arrive at certainty where, heretofore, much was mere guess-work, and I cherish the hope that, from this point of view, my contribution will be welcomed by the comparative philologist, and will be serviceable to the general cause of learning, as well as a useful volume within that narrower circle, whose requirements I was specially bound not to overlook, of persons whose main purpose is to be taught how to write and speak the modern Tibetan tongue.'

While stressing the importance of the 'accurate and copious illustrations and examples' of the usage of words, mentioned by Jäschke, it must be admitted that with hardly any edition of Tibetan texts available, Jäschke was unable to give exact references to texts, and even in the few instances, when he could have done so, as in the case of Schmidt's *hDzañs-blun* and Schiefner's edition of Tāranātha's *Ch'os-byun*, he limited himself to doubtful or otherwise exceptional cases. The professed purpose of adding his sources was that of dating the usage observed. The careful distinction (often by the addition of a question mark) between well established and doubtful meanings or verb forms (including alternative forms given in parentheses) reflects the excellency of his work and makes it imperative to refer always to Jäschke's original

¹ Owing to Jäschke's ill-health at the time of the publication of the English version, certain mistakes (loss of text, and misprints) have remained undetected, which can be corrected by comparing the German version.

entry when consulting Das' Dictionary, as the latter, even when incorporating Jäschke's entries in their entirety, normally leaves out not only all sources given, but also ignores qualifications and alternatives of the kind just mentioned. Nor can Das be relied upon to have included all the information to be found in the corresponding entry of Jäschke's Dictionary. Though published a generation after Jäschke's Tibetan-German Dictionary, and 20 years after his Tibetan-English version, Das' Dictionary has, in fact, by no means superseded Jäschke.

5. SARAT CHANDRA DAS (1849-1917)

With the publication in Calcutta in 1902 of Sarat Chandra Das' *Tibetan-English Dictionary with Sanskrit Synonyms* (reprinted since then in China [Peking 1951], and more recently, in conveniently reduced size, in Japan, and also now in India), history seems to have repeated itself. Just as Schmidt's Dictionary may be described as a German translation of Csoma's dictionary, with additions from two Tibetan-Mongolian dictionaries and the '*Four language Mirror*', Das' Dictionary could be called a much enlarged version of Jäschke's Dictionary. Sarat Chandra Das spent ten years (from 1889 to 1899) in the preparation of this dictionary, which was then entrusted to the Revds. Graham Sandberg (1851-1905) and Wilhelm Heyde (1825-1907) for revision and completion.¹ According to the revisors' preface (p. xii), they were very much concerned not only first with 'the material having been put together in somewhat heterogeneous fashion, hardly systematic enough for a dictionary' but also 'secondly with the vast amount of original matter having been throughout greatly interlarded with lengthy excerpts from Jäschke's Dictionary, not always separable from the new information', and, so we are told, 'this imparted a second-hand appearance to large portions of the work, which was in reality, by no

¹ See also E. H. C. Walsh, 'The Tibetan Language and recent dictionaries,' *JASB* 72 (1903/4), 65-86.

means deserved'. Or, on page xv, 'secondly, our task has been one of substitution.¹ Many articles have had to be freshly written, or at least re-compiled. In place of the innumerable excerpts from Jäschke, already referred to, we have had to examine and to treat *de novo* the grammar and general usage of a large number of the commoner nouns, adjectives, and verbs, notably the verbs'. When comparing entries in both Dictionaries, the dependence of Sarat Chandra Das on Jäschke is just as obvious as that of Schmidt on Csoma. While it would be unprofitable today, i.e. more than sixty years after the appearance of Das' Dictionary, to make up a balance sheet and establish in detail what was owed to Jäschke and what was Das' own, the position may perhaps be summarized as follows : Das ignored the distinctions made by Jäschke between meanings printed in bold and in Roman and almost always left out Jäschke's sources which, though not referring to pages or lines, indicate the time of a meaning or usage given. On the other hand Das' Dictionary is indispensable in view of the great amount of new material, particularly of compounds and of extracts from more recent literature. He also included many more proper names, religious terms and geographical material. Furthermore he excerpted an important Dictionary of synonyms (abbreviated by him as *Mñon* ²), included many more glosses than Jäschke from indigenous lexicographical works and sometimes quoted, as did before him Schiefner,³ directly from the Kanjur and Tanjur, then giving exact references. The greatest drawback of both Das' and Jäschke's dictionaries is that neither author had access to Csoma's manuscript translation of the

¹ The entries *hgroñ-ba* and *rgyugs-pa* which I suspected to have dropped out in this process of 'substitution' are to be found, as Professor Stein kindly informs me, under their 'perfect forms' *groñs* and *brgyugs*. Apparently there are a number of similar cases which the author (or his editors) failed to cover by cross references.

² See below, p. 97, where the title is given in full. Das, in his list of abbreviations (p. xxx), left out the words *kyi bstan-bcos* after *mñon-brjod* (= *Abhidhānaśāstra*).

³ See below, p. 100, n. 1.

*Mahāvvyutpatti*¹ so that words and compounds so far only listed there have not yet been included.

6. AUGUSTIN DESGODINS' DICTIONARY

Das' dictionary was preceded by the *Dictionnaire tibétain-latin-français par les missionnaires catholiques du Thibet*, generally referred to, by the name of its editor (1826–1913), as Desgodins' Dictionary (Hong Kong 1899). But Das did not make use of it, nor were his two editors prepared to follow E. H. C. Walsh's suggestion, mentioned in the article just quoted, to add in an appendix words recorded in Desgodins' Dictionary but not included in Das. The dictionary presents the lexicographic material collected by the French mission since 1852 and also pays attention to dialectal features of Eastern Tibet. Furthermore it is of special interest in so far as it contrasts in many entries ancient and modern words for the same object or concept, basing itself there on Tibetan glosses.² Like Da Penna's, Csoma's, and Schmidt's dictionaries it does not give illustrations of meanings by examples other than compounds.

Nor will such examples occur in the posthumous edition of G. N. Roerich's *Tibetan–Sanskrit–Russian–English Dictionary*, which otherwise will greatly enrich our knowledge of Tibetan. As far as I can judge from proofs and a specimen print, there will be merely equivalents in Russian, English, and sometimes Sanskrit, so that Jäschke and Das would seem unique in so far as they contain examples. I must repeat that Jäschke hardly ever and Das not too frequently, refer to pages or lines of a text quoted. Particularly disconcerting from that point of view are in fact Jäschke's quotations from the Tanjur.

II. Tibetan–Sanskrit and Sanskrit–Tibetan Dictionaries

For accurate quotations we have to rely on a number of indexes and concordances made by a few scholars in connexion

¹ See below, p. 93. As we shall see, Csoma's MS. was, however, incomplete.

² See below, p. 99. Cf. also R. A. Stein, *Recherches sur l'épopée et le barde au Tibet*, Paris, 1959, p. 180, n. 163.

with Sanskrit texts they have edited or translated and to which they refer. But before dealing with them in more detail I shall turn to two Sanskrit-Tibetan dictionaries whose importance will be readily seen from the fact that they have been incorporated in the Tanjur.

1. THE *MAHĀVYUTPATTI*

The *Mahāvyutpatti* was written at the beginning of the 9th century, as is evident from the research on the history of its compilation conducted by Professor Tucci,¹ the late Dr. Alfonsa Ferrari,² and Professor N. Simonsson.³ Its express purpose was the codification and thereby unification of the Tibetan translation of Buddhist terms, deviation from which was threatened with severe punishment.⁴ The greatest interest attaches to this early lexicographic codification, which enables us to date words and their usage to a special period, though of course not dispensing us from the duty of confirming the usage by examples from actual texts. The Tibetan translation of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādins seems to agree closely with the choice of terms prescribed by the *Mahāvyutpatti*. Already Csoma de Kőrös had seen the importance of this work. The first two parts of his translation, extant as a manuscript, were published jointly by Sir Denison Ross and Satis Chandra Vidyābhūṣana, 1910-16; the third (and last) part by Duran Charan Chatterjee in 1944.⁵ The Russian scholar I. P.

¹ *The Tombs of the Tibetan Kings*, Rome, 1950, p. 15.

² Arthavinīśaya, *Atti Reale Accademia d'Italia. Classe di scienze morali e storiche. Serie 7* (1944), Vol. 4, 535-626.

³ *Indo-tibetische Studien*, I (Uppsala, 1957).

⁴ One further purpose of the work was apparently to make translations more easily understood. See Bu-ston's *History of Buddhism (Ch'os-byuñ)*, transl. by E. Obermiller, Heidelberg, 1931, pp. 196/7 and p. 197, n. 1364a.

⁵ *R.As.Soc. of Bengal, Memoirs* 4, pts. 1-3. Owing to its publication during the war, the third part is not generally available in libraries with oriental collections. It is preceded by a Preface by Kalidasa Nag which brings to an end the history of the publication of the work, commenced (in the Preface to the first part) by Sir Denison Ross. A synopsis at the end of Pt. 3 refers from Sakaki's and Minayeff's headings to the sequence of chapters as found in Csoma's MS. The numbering has been added by the

Minayeff (1887, 2nd Ed. by N. D. Mironov, 1911, Bibl. Buddhica, Vol. 13) established the Sanskrit text and the Japanese scholar Sakaki Ryōzaburō (1872–1946)¹ published in 1916 the Sanskrit and Tibetan texts, adding the Chinese terms (which, however, are of much later date) from the copy of a manuscript which Stanislas Julien had prepared in Paris (jointly with P. E. Foucaux), availing himself of a four-language manuscript (Sanskrit–Tibetan–Mongolian–Chinese), discovered in Peking and from there transferred to St. Petersburg in 1853. Sakaki also added a Japanese translation of the entries, except when the meaning was sufficiently clear (and correct) from the Chinese version. The mere fact that he also numbered through the entries—there are 9,565 entries in 283 sections—has enabled Buddhist scholars all over the world to refer to the entries of the *Mahāvvyūṭpatti* by number, quoting Sakaki's name as an editor, but, for the most part, unaware of his very considerable work both in translating entries whose meaning is not obvious from the Chinese, and in tracing the sources of entries. Furthermore Sakaki compiled a Sanskrit Index (1925) and Nishio Kyōo, another Japanese scholar, provided (in 1936) a Tibetan index. The Suzuki Foundation recently subsidized a reprint of this important work, which had been out of print for many years.

I shall give a short description of the contents of the *Mahāvvyūṭpatti* to show the range of topics it comprises: starting with terms which name Buddha, or describe his

Editors, the reference in brackets, indicating the sequence of chapters in the Tanjur, is Csoma's own. It seems likely that the (MS.) copy used by Csoma had got disarranged before he started work on it, and that by the time he became aware of the disarrangement it was too late for him to change it. In the form the work was printed, the colophon appears in fact on p. 249 of the second part. The Synopsis operates with 284 sections of Sakaki's edition, although in fact there are only 283. Therefore allowance for 'plus or minus one' must be made when using it. In the MS. copy used by Csoma the number of entries, particularly of the larger sections, has apparently been greatly reduced by the copyist. More recently the Indian scholar Satis Chandra Vidyābhūṣaṇa (1870–1920) has fallen victim to the same labour saving device. (See below, p. 96, n. 2.)

¹ Professor K. Enoki has kindly communicated to me these dates.

wisdom, his power, his marks, and dealing in a similar way with Bodhisattvas, the dictionary passes on to other Buddhist terms, most of which are listed in numbered groups (like the '10 earths' *daśabhūmi*, the '10 perfections' *daśapāramitā*), etc. More than half through the sections we are acquainted with the Indian Pantheon proper (§ 164 : *Laukika-devatā*), both generally and specifically (§ 167 : deva-nāga's, § 168 : nāga-rāja's, § 170 : yakshas, §§ 171–174 : gandharvas, asuras, garuḍas, kinnaras). Names of sages and great teachers follow, then great kings, and persons in their various positions in life and occupations, from the king down to the craftsman. The next sections deal with casts (§ 188), kinship terms (§ 189), parts of the body (§ 190), geography (§ 194 : places, § 195 : mountains, § 196 : sea, lakes, rivers, etc.), names of trees (§ 197), linguistic terms (§ 210), declension (§ 211), names of pretas (§ 213), of animals (§ 214 : 148 entries), of the hells (§ 216), of the 18 kinds of knowledge (§ 217), of music and musical instruments, melodies and dances (§ 219). As can be seen, contents of sections gradually pass over from strictly religious terms to what one would expect a secular topical dictionary to contain, and this process indeed continues with certain exceptions right to the end. Both the avowed intention of terminological codification, adopted, as I said before, by the sect of the Mūlasarvāstivādins, and the early date of its compilation establish the unique position the *Mahāvvyūtpatti* may justly claim to hold among the Sanskrit-Tibetan dictionaries.

2. THE *AMARAKOŚA*

Apart from the *Mahāvvyūtpatti* we find in the Tanjur also a Tibetan translation of Amarasimha's *Amarakośa*. However it has been included without its Sanskrit original¹ and the translation, which like the original is in verse, is of much

¹ The Sanskrit text has, however, been added in the edition, by Satis Chandra Vidyābhūṣaṇa, *Bibliotheca Indica*, No. 204 (= N.S. Nos. 1294 and 1333), Calcutta 1911–12.

later date.¹ It must be borne in mind that verbs are excluded from this, as from other Sanskrit topical dictionaries. So far we do not possess a Tibetan Index to the *Amarakośa*² to match Nishio's Index to the *Mahāvvyutpatti*.

3. *TS'É-RIN DBAÑ-RGYAL'S DICTIONARY, THE PRAJÑĀ, AND THE*
MÑON-BRJOD-KYI BSTAN-BCOS MK'AS-PAHI RNA-RGYAN

The contents of the *Amarakośa* on the one hand and its Tibetan translation on the other have survived in the garb of bilingual dictionaries and vocabularies, though only future research will be able to show to what extent that is the case. We witness a good many compilations by later Tibetan scholars which quote the *Amarakośa* as their principal sources. I should like to mention in particular first the Dictionary by Ts'é-riñ dbañ-rgyal, photographically reproduced by Professor

¹ The translator Grags-pa rGyal-mts'an (Kirtidhvaja) of Yar-luñ is, no doubt, identical with the lo-tsa-ba of the same name of Yar-kluñ who is mentioned frequently in the *Blue Annals* (see the Index in G. N. Roerich's translation [2 vols., Calcutta, 1949-53]). According to the latter work he can be dated to the latter half of the 13th century—beginning of the 14th century. Grags-pa rGyal-mts'an, who is also given a Eulogy in the Tanjur (apparently missing in the Peking Tanjur [see P. Cordier's *Catalogue du fonds tibétain de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, Vol. 2, p. 13], but preserved in the Narthang and Derge Prints [see Narthang, *bsTod-ts'ogs*, pp. 274B¹-275A⁷, and, for Derge, No. 1171 of the *Complete Catalogue of the Buddhist Canons* by H. Ui (and others), Sendai, 1934]), has also the translation of hundreds of Sādhana's in the Tanjur to his credit (see Ui, loc. cit., Nos. 3400-3635, and also the entry Grags-pa rGyal-mts'an on p. 185 in the section on translators of the Index Volume CLXVIII of the *Tibetan Tripitaka*), as well as the translation, preserved in the Kanjur (see Ui, loc. cit., No. 474), of the *Raktayamāri-tantrarāja*. The latter translation is mentioned both in the *Blue Annals* (Roerich, loc. cit., Vol. I, p. 379) and, though ascribed there to a different translator, in Buston's *History of Buddhism (C'os byuñ)* (transl. by E. Obermiller, 1931, Vol. II, p. 224 and note 1677, see also same page and notes 1678-1680 concerning Grags-pa rGyal-mts'an [transcribed by Obermiller as Dag-pa-gyal-tshen]).

² A commentary to the *Amarakośa*, the *Amara-ṣikā-kāmadhenu* by Subhūticandra, which apparently has not survived in Sanskrit, has also been included in the Tanjur. It may be mentioned in passing that it covers much more than the 82 śloka's reproduced in Satis Chandra Vidyābhūṣaṇa's edition of the commentary in the *Bibliotheca Indica* (N.S. No. 1348, Calcutta, 1912). See also above, p. 93, n. 1.

J. Bacot (Paris, 1930), who translates its title as ‘*Merveilleuse guirlande de mots Sanskrits utiles, rassemblés dans l’ordre alphabétique des même mots tibétains*’ (*Nye-bar mk’o-baḥi legs-sbyar-gyi skad ḥbod-kyi brda kālihi p’reṅ bsgrigs ṅo-mts’ar nor-buḥi do-sal*). Secondly the (likewise photographically reproduced) *Prajñā (Śes-rab)*, compiled in 1771 by bsTan-ḥdzin rgyal-mts’an¹ which has now been published (1962) by the Namgyal Institute of Tibetology in Gangtok, Sikkim, and thirdly the block print of 80 leaves used by Sarat Chandra Das for his list of synonyms at the end of many entries, the *Mñon-brjod-kyi bstan-bcos mk’as-paḥi rna-rgyan*.² The lack of examples from actual texts makes itself felt as urgently in the case of these three works, as does the need of studying the history of the words included.

In his Preface to the first work, Professor Bacot pointed out that the number of words contained in it (15,000) surpass those of the *Mahāvvyutpatti*, though many words contained in the latter work are missing in the former, which therefore presents us with *un contingent notable de mots nouveaux*. The implied challenge to Tibetan lexicography has so far remained unanswered.

4. THE TIBETAN-SANSKRIT DICTIONARY BY DR. LOKESH CHANDRA

We owe to the Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary by Dr. Lokesh Chandra (12 vols., Delhi, International Academy of Indian Culture, 1959–1961, 2,560 pp.) the incorporation in one and the same alphabet and clear setting out of Tibetan words and their Sanskrit equivalents, collected from numerous sources. The list of the main works extracted for this purpose, set out on pp. 11–14 of the Preface, includes about 30 works, among them Das’ ‘Sanskrit synonyms’ and the *Mahāvvyutpatti*. Of

¹ Āgama-dhara Jina-dhvaja, in Prof. Nalinaksha Dutt’s Sanskritization given in the Foreword (p. ix) to an edition of 3 pts. of the work, Gangtok, 1961.

² I should like to thank Professor R. A. Stein for making a copy of this book available to me. Cf. also above, p. 91, n. 2.

special interest for our purpose are the various indexes and concordances with the help of whose data it is possible to write out examples of the use of the word in question by comparing the passages in the Sanskrit text and in the Tibetan translation (though only in rare cases will the edition concerned include both the original and the translation). As it would have been impossible for Dr. Lokesh Chandra to verify the actual quotations, we must be prepared to find in his Dictionary a number of ghost words¹ due to mistakes in the Indexes.

Indexes extracted in that way include publications by G. Nagao, J. Nobel, E. Obermiller, J. Rahder, D. T. Suzuki, H. Ui and F. Weller.

To these names must be added that of Professor F. W. Thomas, who in the third volume of his *Texts and Literary Documents concerning Chinese Turkestan* (1935-55) also gives exact text references. Lists of words are also included in publications by Professor R. A. Stein and Drs. M. Hofinger and D. L. Snellgrove.

III. Tibetan-Tibetan, Tibetan-Mongolian and Tibetan-Chinese Dictionaries

In view of the huge amount of translations from Sanskrit, the preponderance of Tibetan-Sanskrit dictionaries is only to be expected. As far as Tibetan-Tibetan dictionaries are concerned, it will be convenient to list them together with the Tibetan-Mongolian dictionaries, as most representatives of the latter kind consist merely of a Mongolian inter-linear translation of the Tibetan gloss. In a similar way the Tibetan-Tibetan Dictionary by dGe-śes Ch'os-grags, was recently (1957) (re-)published in Peking with a Chinese translation.²

¹ One such ghost word is, e.g., the entry *bsgroñ*, an erroneous reading for *bskyod* arising from a mistake in the Tibetan Index (p. 45L) to Suzuki's edition of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*.

² The original edition in Tibetan only was published in Lhasa in 1949.

The conversion in the 16th century of the Mongols to lamaism resulted in a full-scale translation of the canonical literature, as embodied in the Kanjur, translated into Mongolian in the 17th century, and Tanjur, translated in the 18th century. Along with this huge translation work for whose history I wish to refer in particular to the writings of Dr. W. Heissig, we witness the reprint of various earlier smaller grammatical and lexicographic works by Tibetan scholars with a Mongolian translation, as well as the publication of the two Tibetan-Mongolian dictionaries, mentioned as I. J. Schmidt's sources,¹ and the *Four language Mirror* (identical as far as its four language entries are concerned, with the *Five language Mirror*, which was recently reprinted by Peking from a manuscript in which Eastern Turkish has been added. It is apparently the intention to publish Indexes to this 'pentaglotte' in all five languages).

While limiting myself here to give merely the titles of such works as the *Min-gi rgya-mts'o*, of which the *Nyi-hod*¹ forms a part, or the *bDag-yig mk'as-pahi byun-gnas*, the last part of which contains a very valuable list of obsolete words with their more modern equivalents, viz. the *brDa gsar rnyin-gi skor*, also used by Desgodins in his Dictionary, I wish to stress in particular the importance of a recent publication by the Mongolian Academy in Ulan Bator, viz. the Tibetan-Tibetan Dictionary (with an interlinear Mongolian translation) by the Mongol scholar Sumatiratna² (in two quarto vols. of 1,241 and 1391 pp., being Vols. VI and VII of the *Corpus Scriptorum Mongolorum*, Ulan Bator, 1959). The Tibetan explanation is sometimes followed by a Sanskrit equivalent. The dictionary not only allows of an easy checking of the meanings included in Jäschke's and Das' dictionaries as taken over from Schmidt, but is in fact invaluable in so far as it has preserved many glosses not available elsewhere, and also provides a Mongolian translation where glosses are missing.

¹ See above, p. 88.

² Dr. A. Róna Tas kindly informs me that the dictionary was originally compiled in 1877.

IV. The present lexicographic situation and the Tibetan Tripiṭaka

The preceding survey clearly shows that in the field of Tibetan lexicography Jäschke's Dictionary occupies a unique position.

Unfortunately, apart from S. C. Das, Jäschke has had no successor. What we are left with, may well be described as 'Lexicographic Raw Material' of varying degrees of rawness, consisting on the one hand of *word lists* and on the other hand of *indexes* and *glossaries*. As far as the *word lists* are concerned, one is reminded of the 'nackte Wörterverzeichnisse'—a term used by Jäschke (in his preface to his German version of 1871) when referring to Csoma's and Schmidt's dictionaries, as they usually merely translate one Tibetan word by one word in either Sanskrit, or Mongolian or Chinese, the two latter kinds of works being in fact preponderantly based on Tibetan-Tibetan glosses.

The *indexes* and *glossaries*, on the other hand, owing to their accurate quotations, enable us, though with a very considerable effort, to study words in their context and so make them an indispensable prerequisite for any future Tibetan dictionary.

In the last year or so, the lexicographic situation in Tibetan has, however, undergone a radical change from another point of view, or rather it has done so *potentially*. Quoting directly from the Kanjur and Tanjur for lexicographic purposes—a terrifying procedure practised about a hundred years ago by A. Schiefner¹—who significantly happened to be both scholar and librarian—and also occasionally by Das, has suddenly become generally acceptable and, to my mind, even imperative. Owing to the scarcity of the original Tibetan blockprints as well as to their unwieldiness, which makes it almost as difficult to store them as to consult them, consultation of the Tibetan Canon for the sake of a single word could only be envisaged in very exceptional cases and it would have been unthinkable to check more than one or two quotations in different works during one library visit. With the recent

¹ Schiefner, who believed to quote the Narthang print, quoted in fact the Derge print. Das' quotations refer to the Narthang print.

publication in Japan of a photographic reproduction of the Peking 17th century xylograph of the Kanjur and Tanjur, the situation has changed, however. With the *Tibetan Tripiṭaka* (in 168 vols., Kyoto 1959–61, of which the Canon proper comprises the first 150 vols.) has made it possible to quote passages accurately by volume, page, section (each of the five sections of a page corresponding to one page of the original blockprint) and line,¹ and owing to the arrangement of the reprint in well-bound volumes which are convenient to handle, these quotations can easily and speedily be checked, provided the scholar has access to the shelves. In spite of its high price, it is to be expected that the *Tibetan Tripiṭaka* may soon be available in the major Oriental Libraries and Institutes all over the world. Tibetan scholars will then, as a matter of course, quote the *Tibetan Tripiṭaka* for their Tibetan sources just as Buddhist scholars have become used to quote the *Taishō Tripiṭaka* for their Chinese texts.

While, then, there is ground for some optimism as far as lexicographic work on the Tibetan canonical literature is concerned, it must not be forgotten that this enormous Tibetan translation literature is matched by an almost equal amount of original literature, both religious and secular, in the latter case mostly historical.

Even then, two further fields will still have to be covered from the lexicographic point of view, viz., the Tun Huang texts on the one hand and the modern dialects on the other.²

¹ As in the case of the *Taishō Tripiṭaka*, I have used Roman figures for the volumes and Arabic for the pages, followed by a–e for the five sections and by superior figures 1–8 for the eight lines of each page.

² I wish to mention in this connexion apart from the *Tibetan Word Book* by Sir Basil Gould and H. E. Richardson (Oxford Univ. Press, 1943), the *Eastern Tibetan Dictionary* ed. by Minoru Gō (and others) (Okayama, 1954) and for its inclusion of the contemporary language, the *Kraiikiy tibetsko-russkiy slovar* by B. V. Semichov, Yu. M. Parfionovich and B. D. Dandaron. Ed. by Yu. M. Parfionovich (Moscow, 1963). Prof. J. de Jong kindly made available to me the Tibetan–Chinese dictionary *Dag-yig t'on-miḥi dgoḥs-rgyan* by Ts'e-tan Ṣabs-drun. 2 vols., Hsi-Ning, 1955–57, mentioned also (p. 479) by J. Kolmaš in his paper 'On some more recent Tibetanistic publications edited in the Chinese People's Republic' (*Archiv Orientalni*, 29, 1961, 476–479).

In either case we may probably expect in the first instance monographs devoted to their study, before the integration of all this material into one *Thesaurus linguae Tibetanae* may eventually be contemplated.

V. Etymological Research

Within the framework of such a 'Thesaurus', etymological research will have to play a major part, and in turning now to the latter field, I should like to demonstrate by a few examples the benefit Tibetan lexicography proper may derive from investigations of that kind. Jäschke's dictionary may again be mentioned as pioneering in so far as it has indicated the most common cases of such contrasts as, to use his terminology, 'neuter verbs' on the one hand and 'transitive' or 'causative verbs' on the other. Changes occurring in the 'parts of the verb', including the addition of prefixes and suffixes, the alternation of voiced and voiceless, aspirated and unaspirated initials, and the alternation of vowels, reminiscent of the Indoeuropean ablaut may be studied, e.g., in the survey by R. Shafer.¹ The occurrence of these alternations, to which palatalization or yodization must be added, will also be observed within the framework of 'Tibetan Word-families', which were first successfully assembled by S. Wolfenden.²

To give examples of all these various changes and of their interplay lies outside the scope of this paper. The cases adduced below would seem not only to be of general interest in so far as they elucidate the history of the words concerned or illustrate features of Tibetan phonology, but to a certain extent are also bound to affect directly the definitions of words and their arrangement in future Tibetan dictionaries.

(1)

(a) *rga-ba* ~ *bgre-ba*

(b) *rgal-ba* ~ *sgrol-ba* ³

¹ 'Studies in the morphology of Bodic verbs' (*BSOAS* xiii (1951), pp. 702-724 and 1017-1031).

² See *AM*, n.s. Vol. i, p. 3, notes 1 and 3-4.

³ There seems to be also a 'present' *sgral-ba*, see *AM*, N.S., Vol. i, p. 13, n. 1.

The *r*-metathesis¹ and vowel-change, shared by the two examples (a) 'to be old' and 'to grow old', and (b) 'to cross' and 'to ferry over' have obscured the derivation and, in the case of (b), resulted in the verb *sgrol-ba* 'to ferry over' being combined in Jäschke's Dictionary in one and the same entry with *sgrol-ba* 'to rescue, deliver, save', the latter verb belonging with *hgrol-ba* 'to become free' [Pf. *grol*] and *hgrol-ba* 'to loosen, untie' [Pf. *bkrol*]. *sgrol-ma* 'Tara' (Sanskrit. *tārā*) belongs with *rgal-ba* (the goddess who ferries over).

(2)

(a) *lag* ~ *p'yag*(b) *logs* ~ *p'yogs*

The ordinary word for 'hand' (a) with its honorific and the two words for 'side, direction' (b) seem to point to an original initial cluster 'labial plosive + *l*'. It is also likely that (b) is a derivative of (a) showing vowel change and an *s*-suffix which may represent the word *sa/so* 'place'. On the semantic side, cp. English 'on every hand' for 'on all sides'. *p'yag* 'hand' recalls Chinese *bey* 臂 'arm' (Karlgren, *Grammata Serica (Recensa)*, No. 853 archaic *piěg*).

(3)

(a) *lce* ~ *ljags*(b) *gre-ba* ~ *hgrag(s)-pa*

The ordinary word for 'tongue' (a) and its honorific are obviously cognates, as are the two words for 'hand', listed under (2a). *ljags* seems to be a derivative (by means of palatalization and *s* suffix) of *ldag-pa* 'to lick'. The reason for the loss of voicedness in the initial cluster of *lce* has still to be explained. In *lce*, *ljags* and *ldag* we also witness *l*-metathesis.² Similarly *gre-ba* 'throat' (b) belongs with *hgrags-pa* 'to utter a sound' (cp. also *sgreg-pa* 'to belch' and *sgrog-pa* (Pf. *bsgrags*) 'to call (out), shout, scream'). For the absence and presence of the final consonant and the change of vowel, *dpag* 'measure', *dpog-pa* (Pf. *dpags*) 'to measure, to

¹ See *AM*, loc. cit., pp. 10, etc.² Cf. *AM*, loc. cit., p. 12.

proportion' and *dpe* 'pattern, model' may be adduced as parallels. (On the semantic side cp. Latin *modus* 'measure', and *modulus*, the etymon of English 'model'.)

(4)

$c'u \sim c'ab$

The ordinary word for water *c'u* (from which *hc'u-ba* 'to draw water' is derived) shows, when compared with its honorific *c'ab* presence and absence of a final labial in like manner as it was observed under (3a) in the case of a final guttural. The word family¹ *rdzu-ba* 'to give a deceptive appearance, to disguise oneself' with cognates like *rzab* 'mud, mire', *rdzab-rzub* 'sham, emptiness, falsehood, *rdzob-po* 'vain, empty' provides further parallels concerning a final labial.

(5)

(a) *dri-ma* \sim *dreg(s)-pa*

(b) *sti-ba* \sim *stegs*

Presence and absence of final consonant, change of vowel and (optional) suffix is to be observed in the two words for 'dirt' (a), distinguished by Jäschke as the one that is washed off (*dri-ma*) or removed by scraping (*dreg(s)-pa*). In a similar way, the word for 'to rest' (b) is contrasted with 'any contrivance for putting things on' (stand, board, table, stool), in fact 'a rest'. On the phonetic side cf. also the alternative forms *sdi-ba* and *sdi-g-pa* 'to show, point out'.²

(6)

(a) *srel-ba* \sim *srol*

(b) *hded-pa* \sim *hdod-pa*

(c) *hgren-ba* \sim *hgron-ba*

The three pairs constitute clear cases of derivation by means of change of vowel (ablaut). *srol* 'usage' (a) is derived from a verb *srel-ba* 'to hold' and 'to rear, bring up'. *hded-pa*

¹ Cf. also *AM*, loc. cit., pp. 5-6.

² For similar contrasts in the case of dental finals, cf. Jäschke, *Tibetan Grammar, Addenda* by A. H. Francke, assisted by W. Simon, Berlin, 1929, pp. 120-121.

'to walk behind, to pursue, run after' (*b*) is contrasted with *hdod-pa* 'to desire', as is *hgren-ba* 'to stand (erect) (c) with *hgron-ba*, the honorific for 'to die'. The semantic connexion in (c) can be supported by the etymon of *hgren-ba*, *ren-ba* 'to be stiff, hard, rigid'. The connexion reveals an original initial cluster *nr-*, which can be confirmed by the obviously cognate Chinese *ning* 凝 (archaic *ngiang*, Karlgren, *GSR*, No. 956a).¹ On the semantic side cf. 'stiff' for 'corpse' and German '*starr*' ~ '*sterben*'. *sgren-ba* 'to erect' is a further derivation.

The previous six groups of examples, which showed etymological relationship between certain words and their honorifics, or illustrated *l-* and *r-*metathesis, or suggested original consonantal clusters, or loss of a final consonant, or evidenced derivation by means of palatalization or vowel change, or by a suffix, were only in one case (*sgrol*) also concerned with the meaning as recorded in our dictionaries. The next examples are meant to illustrate this point further.

(7) To quote Tibetan *gseb* as a first example, it has been possible to eliminate from its entry in Jäschke's or, for that matter, Das' dictionary, the meaning of 'small interstices between things or persons thronged together' by showing that such a meaning is incompatible with the meaning of 'crowd and multitude', and with such words as *gsob-pa* 'to fill out', *ts'ab* 'substitute', *tsam* 'as, much as' (Sansk. *mātra*), etc.²

(8) In a similar way, the explanation of *sel* 'crystal, glass' as a palatalized derivative of *sel-ba* will induce us to define the latter verb as 'to cleanse', hence 'to remove', rather than 'to remove, esp. impurities', hence 'to cleanse', as Jäschke did. Two other members of the word family, *gsal-ba* 'to be clear, distinct, bright' and *bśal-ba* 'to wash, wash out or off, clean by washing, rinse' clearly bear out this assumption.

(9) The connexion of *hbrin* 'middle' *hbrin-po* 'the middle

¹ See also 'The Reconstruction of original cluster "Nasal + r" through Tibetan-Chinese word equations' in *Trudui mezhdunar. Kongressa Vostokovedov*, Vol. v, pp. 163-169.

² See *BSOAS* xx (1957), pp. 523-532.

one (of three sons) ' with *hbrañ-ba*, also *hbren-ba*, and (in the phrase *zabs hbrin-ba*) *hbrin-ba* ' to follow ', which recalls Latin *secundus* from *sequi*, may be further extended to *hp'reñ(-ba)* or *p'reñ(-ba)* ' string, thread, cord on which things are filed, strung, or ranged, wreath, garland, rosary ' and to *hp'reñ-ba* ' to love, to be fond of, greatly attached to ', thereby underlining the meaning of ' following as a member of a series or range ', which the meaning of ' middle ' without further reference fails to convey.

I conclude the list of examples with two words of which the first has been too narrowly defined in our Western dictionaries, and the other apparently so far not been included in any dictionary in the meaning concerned.

(10) *hbyog-pa* (Pf. *byogs*) was, on the authority of Csoma and Tibetan lexicographers, explained by Jäschke as ' to lick '. The reason for the definition is that *hbyog-pa* often occurs in connexion with *lces* (' by means of the tongue ').

But in a passage which occurs in the Tibetan version of the *Vinayavibhanga* ¹ the meaning ' to lick ' is out of the question. The passage describes ogresses (*rākṣasī*'s) devouring men. ' They scrape with their fingertips any drop of (hot) blood (of their victim) which falls to the ground and then put it in their mouths together with the earth ' : *De-dag skyes-bu za-ba na k'rag dron-moñi t'igs-pa sa-la ltuñ* (4) *ba gañ-dag yin-pa de-dag kyañ/sor-moñi rtse-mos/byogs siñ sa-dañ bcas-par k'ar hjug-par hgyuro*.

A similar context is provided by dGe-bśes C'os-kyi Grags-pa's dictionary ² (p. 606) : *lhuñ-bzed sor-mos hbyog-paḥam p'or-ba lce-yis bldag lta-bu* (' as in " to scrape the alms bowl with one's finger or licking a cup clean with one's tongue " ').³

¹ The passage formed part of the *Māṇḍikāyā* story or ultimately the *Rākṣasī-Sūtra*, but has not survived in Sanskrit in the present text of the *Divyāvadāna* (see p. 524²⁰ of the edition by E. B. Cowell and R. A. Neil, Cambridge, 1886). However, it is included both in the Chinese (*Taiśhō Tripitaka* XXIII, 889b⁷) and the Tibetan versions (Narthang, *hDul, Nya* 282A³⁻⁴; *Tibetan Tripitaka* XLIII, 210c³⁻⁴).

² See above, p. 98.

³ The Chinese translation of the dictionary has *gua* ' to scrape ' and *tean* ' to lick '.

The definition resulting from the examples, viz. 'to clean out', as to remove remnants of food from a receptacle (by scraping or licking) suggests an etymological connexion of *hbyog-pa* with *hbyañ-ba* 'to clean, cleanse, purify' and *hbyon-ba* (Pf. *byañ-ba*) 'to be cleansed, purified'.

(11) The word which has so far not been included in our dictionaries in the meaning I am going to suggest is *rañs-pa*.¹ When first meeting the word in a story included in the Tibetan version of the *Karmaśataka*,² I proposed the meaning of 'straight', linking it up with *drañ-po* 'straight' and *sroñ-ba* 'to straighten'. In the light of examples discovered later, including a passage in the *Abhiḥharmakośa*,³ in which *ma rañs-pa*, referring to the 'incomplete' face of the moon, translates Sanskr. *vikala*, it seems clear that *rañs-pa* means in fact, 'entire, complete, unimpaired' and is therefore synonymous with *rañs-po* preserved in two glosses, included in Das' and Sumatiratna's dictionaries, viz. *rañs-po* = *ts'añ-ma* 'all, whole, entire' (Das, p. 1166) and *rañs-po* = *ril-po* 'the whole, the entire thing' (Sumatiratna, Vol. 2, p. 893). While reserving for another occasion a detailed discussion of the various examples with their references, I wish to emphasize in conclusion that, as already pointed out in my previous article, the addition of *rañs-pa* to our dictionaries in the meaning proposed, is bound to modify our views on certain well known words, as *rañ-ba* 'to rejoice' and *rañ* 'self', which must be regarded as its cognates.

13, Lisbon Avenue,
Twickenham, Middx.

¹ I must refrain from discussing here the entry *rañs-pa* in Das' dictionary which lists two other meanings.

² See p. 166 of the paper quoted above, p. 105, n. 1.

³ See La Vallée Poussin, *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu. Troisième Chapitre*, Paris 1928, p. 158. For the Tibetan passage, see *Tibetan Tripiṭaka*, CXV 184d³.